Hug 28 2008 4:50PM ANDREW J WEINSTEIN	Filed 98/29/2008 and age 1 of 2
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	USDC SDNY
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	DOCUMENT
	ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Fred Alston, as a Trustee of the LOCAL 272 LABOR-MANAGEMENT PENSION FUND; Fred Alston, as Trustee of the Local 272 WELFARE FUND,	DOC #: DATE FILED: 829 08  O8 Civ. 4893 (LAP)
Plaintiffs,	AFFIRMATION IN SUPPORT OF CONSENT TO
- against -	CHANGE ATTORNEYS
CAR PARK SYSTEMS,	is approved.
Defendant.	SO ORDERED
CRAIG L. COHEN, ESQ., makes the following affirmation under penalty of perjury.	
1. I am a member of the bar of this court	and submit this affirmation in accordance
with the Court's August 14, 2008 "so ordered" endorsement of attorney Andrew J. Weinstein's	
letter, dated August 13, 2008, and in accordance with Local Rule 1.4.	
2. Substitution is being sought on mutual	agreement of withdrawing counsel

- 2. Substitution is being sought on mutual agreement of withdrawing counsel (myself), incoming counsel, and the client, as evidenced by the consent to change attorneys which has previously been submitted to the Court.
- 3. I had been representing Car Park Systems of New York, Inc. ("CPS") in connection with an audit being conducted by the Plaintiffs. When the instant action was commenced, and given that it related directly to the audit, I filed a notice of appearance on behalf of CPS. On or about July 11, 2008, CPS retained the Law Offices of Andrew J. Weinstein to represent it in connection with the ongoing audit in my place and stead. Given that the instant lawsuit pertains directly to the audit, CPS desires that the Law Offices of Andrew J. Weinstein represent it in connection with the litigation as well.

- 4. Other than the filing of the Complaint and the recent scheduling of an initial case management conference before Magistrate Judge Freeman on September 10, 2008, no other action has taken place in this case (i.e., no discovery, no motions, etc.). The proposed substitution will not cause any delay in this matter.
  - 5. I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is frue and correct.

CRAIC LECOHEN, ESQ.